

S/N 10/527,577  
Page 6 of 8

PU020348  
Customer No. 24498

### Remarks

In response to the Office Action imposing a restriction requirement between Species I (Figure 1) and Species II (Figure 3), Applicants elect, with traverse, the invention of Species I, as represented by Fig. 1. As discussed below, this election is done solely to ensure compliance with the restriction requirement.

Applicants disagree with the reasoning of the restriction requirement, e.g., that the pending claims are directed to more than one species of the generic invention; that the species lack unity of invention "because they are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1" (page 2, Office Action); that "the claims are readable to the different species recite mutually exclusive characteristics of such species" and that there is no generic claim (pages 2-3, Office Action).

Instead, Applicants submit that Species 1 (Fig. 1) and Species II (Fig. 3) are different schematic representations of a generic invention, and contrary to the Office Action, the pending claims do not recite mutually exclusive characteristics for the invention of Fig. 1 and Fig. 3. Furthermore, claim 1 is generic.

Specifically, Fig. 1 and Fig. 3 are different schematic illustrations of a generic inventive concept for a video message system, which includes a combination of components recited in respective claims 1-29. For example, Fig. 1 shows some of the components present in a video message system, while Fig. 3 is a different representation showing some of the components, as well as connections among the components. In other words, Fig. 1 may be considered an overview of the system components, while Fig. 3 further illustrates the couplings (e.g., from an operative viewpoint) among the components.

However, there is nothing mutually exclusive about the characteristics of the components in Fig. 1 and Fig. 3, most of which are common to both Fig. 1 and Fig. 3. Note that even though Fig. 1 does not show connecting lines among the components, it does not mean that the components are not coupled to each other, or that they are necessarily different from those in Fig. 3. Rather, Fig. 1 and Fig. 3 are different views of at least one video message system, e.g., similar to an overview versus a functional view.

Thus, contrary to what was stated in the Office Action, Fig. 1 and Fig. 3 do not represent species with mutually exclusive characteristics.

S/N 10/527,577  
Page 7 of 8

PU020348  
Customer No. 24498

Applicants further submit that independent claim 1 is generic to the invention, and applies to representations of Fig. 1 and Fig. 3. Nonetheless, Fig. 1 is elected solely to ensure compliance with the procedural aspect of the restriction requirement.

To support Applicant's position that claims 1-29 apply to Fig. 1, a listing of some claimed features, and references to Fig. 1 and/or at least the cited sections in the specification, are given below. Even though features of these claims also apply to Fig. 3, only references to Fig. 1 -- i.e., the elected species, are indicated.

Citations to the specification are given in paragraph numbers of the published US application, US 2006/0119707 A1. In addition, most of the claimed features are also mentioned in paragraph 20 of the published application.

Claims	References to Fig. 1
1	video display 115, frame 105 and video camera 110
2	microphone 120; and speaker 125
3	synchronization device 190
4	video display 115
5	memory device 135
6	dynamically updating memory device 135
7	frame 105
8	frame 105
9	microphone 120, speaker 125 and frame 105
10	encryption/decryption device 197
11	user input device (e.g., 165 and other buttons 140, 145, 150 or 155) and password manager 198
12	encryption/decryption device 197
13	delay module (e.g., para. 18, para. 25)
14	specified time corresponds to known time period when children are remote from the system (e.g., para. 18)
15	at least one camera 110
16	processor 130

S/N 10/527,577  
Page 8 of 8

PU020348  
Customer No. 24498

17	memory device 135 and processor 130
18	daily scheduler (e.g., para. 40)
19	visual casino slot machine (e.g., para. 40)
20	remote control device 152
21	telephone feature (e.g., para. 39-40)
22	message indicator 185
23	message indicator 185
24	external bus 180
25	delay module (e.g., para. 18, para. 25)
26	external connector 180
27	timer 195
28	timer 195
29	timer 195

As shown in the above listing, claims 1-29 apply to Fig. 1, and they are properly considered as encompassing the elected invention. Therefore, Applicants submit that there is no need for withdrawing any claims pursuant to the election, and that the response is fully compliant with the restriction requirement.

If the Examiner believes that there are unresolved issues relating to this response, please call the Applicants' representative listed below to expedite the resolution of any remaining issues.

Respectfully submitted,



Wan Yee Cheung  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 42,410  
609-734-6834

Date: 12/26/08

THOMSON Licensing Inc.  
Patent Operations  
PO Box 5312  
Princeton, NJ 08543-5312